

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **15 March 2007**, the examiner reviewed claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-17 and 19-31. Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-17, and 19-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-17, and 19-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bly et al. (U.S. Pub 2002/0077944, hereinafter “Bly.”), in view of Nakamura (USPN 6,633,873 hereinafter “Nakamura”), and further in view of Harris (US Pub. No. 2002/0059204 hereinafter “Harris”).

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-17, and 19-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter for not having a tangible result “when the search involves a local search.” Applicant has amended claims 1, 14, 15, 22, and 23 to “receive the results of the local search” when the above condition is satisfied. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments overcome the stated rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 14, 15, 22, and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over Bly, in view of Holt, and further in view of Harris.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention teaches obtaining results of a remote search, where **these results have been customized for the requesting organization**. The invention discloses that this customized response from a remote source is made possible by enabling the remote sources to verify the identity of the requesting entity, and as a result of the verification tap into any

special deals that may be available to the organization from the remote source. Such a customized response to procurement requests is beneficial since it will reflect on arrangements between the remote sources and the organization that may extend beyond the actual search request itself and reflect special deals with a particular vendor or provider. This finds support on page 9, lines 7-14 of the instant application.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in Bly, Holt, or Harris, either separately or in concert, that teaches enabling responses to remote search requests that are customized to the requesting entity's identity.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14, 15, 22, and 23 to clarify that the present invention teaches that any search request to a remote source includes information that enables the remote source to verify the identity of the requesting entity, and that this verification enables the remote source to give search results that are customized for the requesting entity. These amendments find support in page 9, lines 7-14 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 14-15, and 22-23 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-6, 9-11, 13, 26, 29, and 30, which depend upon claim 1, claims 16-21, 27, and 31, which depend upon claim 15, and claims 24-25, and 28 which depend upon claim 23, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Shun Yao  
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 17 April 2007

Shun Yao  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95618-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1667  
FAX: (530) 759-1665  
Email: shun@parklegal.com